



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/824,460	04/02/2001	David Perry Greene	YOR920010189US1	9516

35526 7590 12/03/2004

DUKE. W. YEE
YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/824,460	Applicant(s) GREENE ET AL.	
	Examiner Mohammad A Siddiqi	Art Unit 2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-89 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-89 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-89 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, filed 08/26/2004, with respect to restriction have been fully considered and are persuasive. Applicant clarification of recited word "parsing" in independent claims 13, 32, 48, and 75 means satisfying a request for cookie file for a particular user. Applicant also clarifies the recited features of claims 19, 33, 54, and 81 means using cookies to access websites. The restriction has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of

paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. Claims 1-15, 19-26, 29-50, 54-56, 59-77, 81-83 and 86-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lund et al. (6,760,758) (hereinafter Lund).

5. As per claim 1, Lund discloses a method in a data processing system for managing cookies, the method comprising:

responsive to a selected event (marked previously, col 6, lines 1-14), requesting a cookie (col 2, line 1) file from a source (place holder, col 6, lines 1-14), wherein the cookie (col 2, line 1) file contains a set of cookies of previously obtained cookies and is associated with a user (col 6, lines 1-4); and
receiving the cookie file (84, fig 2, col 2, line 1 and col 6, lines 1-4), wherein the cookies are to access Web sites (col 6, lines 1-14).

6. As per claim 2, Lund discloses updating the cookie file during a browser session to form an updated cookie file; and responsive to a second selected event, sending the updated cookie file to a source (col 6, lines 1-5 and lines 40-48).

7. As per claim 3, Lund discloses wherein the source is at least one of a server, a desktop computer, a personal digital assistant, and a mobile phone (24, 62,50, fig 1).

8. As per claim 4, Lund discloses the selected event is one of a beginning of a browser session or a particular user input (marking information for retrieval, col 6, lines 40-44).

9. As per claim 5, Lund discloses the first selected event is a beginning of the browser session and the second selected event is a termination of the browser session (moving from device to device, col 8, lines 26-37).

10. As per claim 6, Lund discloses wherein the selected event is a requirement of a cookie to access a Web site (col 7, lines 61-65).

11. As per claim 7, Lund discloses wherein the cookie file includes access information (col 8, lines 26-34).

12. As per claim 8, Lund discloses wherein the cookie file includes authorization data (col 8, lines 26-43).

13. As per claim 9, Lund discloses selectively modifying data within the cookie file for use with the data processing system (col 8, lines 14-25).

14. As per claim 10, Lund discloses the data processing system is one of a laptop computer, a personal digital assistant, a mobile phone, or a smart card (switch device to device, col 8, lines 19-26).

15. As per claim 11, Lund discloses the cookie file is received using a wireless communications link (col 7, lines 60-66 and col 4, lines 1-4).

16. As per claim 12, Lund discloses wherein the cookie file includes information on at least one of sales transactions, user preferences, a history of Web sites visited by a user (col 8, lines 19-26).

17. As per claim 13, Lund discloses receiving a request for a cookie file (col , lines 1-14 and col 2, line1); parsing the request to identify a user associated with the cookie file (col 7, lines 1-3); identifying a particular cookie file associated with the user (col 7, lines 1-15); and transmitting the particular cookie file to the user (col 7, lines 1-15).

18. As per claim 14, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 2, above.

15. As per claim 15, Lund discloses wherein the user is identified by at least one of an Internet Protocol address and a user name in the request (col 7, lines 1-15).

19. As per claim 19, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 13.

20. As per claim 20, Lund discloses a data processing system comprising:
a state information repository (database, col 7, lines 61-64), wherein state information is are maintained for users in the state information repository (Cookies may include information such as login or registration identification, user preferences, online "shopping cart" information, etc, col 7, lines 61-66); and
a Web server, wherein the Web server monitors for requests for cookies from users and returns state information to the users when requests for state information are received (server may serve, col 7, lines 1-15).

21. As per claim 21, Lund discloses the state information includes at least one of a cookie, a browsing history, and a bookmark (col 8, lines 17-25).

22. As per claim 22, Lund discloses a method in data processing system for managing state information, the method comprising: responsive to an event, requesting state information from a source (Cookies may include information such as login or registration identification, user preferences, online "shopping cart" information, etc, col 7, lines 61-66); receiving the state information; and using the state information to access data on a network data processing system (col 8, lines 15-26).

23. As per claim 23, Lund discloses altering the state information in response to accessing the network data processing system to form new state information; and sending the new state information to the source in response to a second event (repeated session, col 8, lines 26-44).

24. As per claim 24, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 21, above.

25. As per claim 25, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 22, above. In addition Lund discloses data within the state information files

are user by the set of users to access information on other data processing systems (various web sites, col 8, lines 21-25); and providing the a user from the set of users access to a state information file associated with the user to access other data processing systems (various web sites, col 8, lines 19-25).

26. As per claim 26, Lund discloses selectively combining state information from state information files within the repository (col 7, lines 61-66) of state information files to form a new state information file (col 8, lines 19-43).

27. As per claim 29, Lund discloses receiving updated information to a state information file within the repository from a user (col 7, lines 61-66); and updating the state information file with the updated information (repeated session, col 8, lines 26-42).

28. As per claim 30, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 21, above.

29. As per claim 31, rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition Lund discloses a bus system; a communications unit connected to the bus system; a memory connected to the bus system, wherein the

memory includes as set of instructions; and a processing unit connected to the bus system (server, 12, fig 1, col 3, lines 41-54).

30. As per claim 32, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 13 and 31, above.

31. As per claim 33, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 13 and 31, above.

32. As per claim 34, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 31 and 25, above.

33. As per claim 35, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 20 and 34, above.

34. As per claim 36, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above.

35. As per claim 37, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 2, above.

36. As per claim 38, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 3, above.

37. As per claim 39, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 4, above.

38. As per claim 40, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 5, above.

39. As per claim 41, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 6, above.

40. As per claim 42, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 7, above.

41. As per claim 43, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 8, above.

42. As per claim 44, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 9, above.

43. As per claim 45, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 10, above.

44. As per claim 46, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 11, above.

45. As per claim 47, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 12, above.

46. As per claim 48, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 13, above.

47. As per claim 49, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 14, above.

48. As per claim 50, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 15, above.

49. As per claim 54, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 33, above.

50. As per claim 55, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 25, above.

51. As per claim 56, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 26, above.

52. As per claim 59, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 27, above.

53. As per claim 60, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 22, above.

54. As per claim 61, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 23, above.

55. As per claim 62, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 21, above.

56. As per claim 63, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above.

Art Unit: 2154

57. As per claim 64, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 2, above.

58. As per claim 65, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 3, above.

59. As per claim 66, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 4, above.

60. As per claim 67, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 5, above.

61. As per claim 68, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 6, above.

62. As per claim 69, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 7, above.

63. As per claim 70, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 8, above.

64. As per claim 71, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 9, above.

65. As per claim 72, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 10, above.

66. As per claim 73, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 11, above.

67. As per claim 74, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 12, above.

68. As per claim 75, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 13, above.

69. As per claim 76, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 14, above.

70. As per claim 77, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 15, above.

71. As per claim 81, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 19, above.

72. As per claim 82, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 25, above.

73. As per claim 83, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 26, above.

74. As per claim 86, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 28, above.

75. As per claim 87, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 22, above.

88. As per claim 88, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 23, above.

76. As per claim 89, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 21, above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

77. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

78. Claims 16-18, 27, 28, 51-53, 57, 58, 78-80, 84, and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lund et al. (6,760,758) (hereinafter Lund) in view of Gupta et al. (6,487,538) (hereinafter Gupta).

79. As per claims 16-18, 27, 52, 53, 57, 79, 80, and 84, Lund fails disclose offering the new state information file for sale to a third party. However Gupta discloses offering the new state information file for sale to a third party (col 6, lines 32-40 and col 17 line 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Lund with Gupta. The motivation would have been selling user information and making lots of money.

80. As per claims 28, 51, 58, 78, and 85, Lund fails to disclose billing the set of users for providing access the repository. However Gupta discloses

the set of users for providing access the repository (col 6, lines 32-40 and col 17 line 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Lund with Gupta. The motivation would have been to have system to store user information and sell user information for fee to other businesses.

Conclusion

81. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U.S. Patent 6,505,230

U.S. patent 6,510,439

U.S. Patent 6,330,566

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad A Siddiqi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3976. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MAS

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "N. El-Hachy". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long, sweeping vertical stroke at the end.